1. Introduction

The environmental review of the Sunrise Powerlink Project (SRPL) project is being conducted by two lead agencies, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for the State of California and the United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for the United States, and therefore is regulated by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under California law and by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) under federal law. San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), the Project proponent, has filed an application with the CPUC for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for approval to construct SRPL. In addition, SDG&E has filed an application for a Right-of-Way Grant with the BLM. As part of the approval process, the CPUC and BLM will prepare the EIR/EIS, which will evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with SRPL and will identify mitigation measures to reduce these impacts, where possible.

The public scoping requirements for CEQA and NEPA differ slightly, however, the intent of each process remains the same — to initiate the public scoping for the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS), provide information about the SRPL Project, and solicit information that will be helpful in the environmental review process.

This Scoping Report for SRPL documents the issues and concerns expressed by members of the public, government agencies, and organizations during the public scoping period. The BLM's Notice of Intent was published on August 31, 2006, initiating the NEPA scoping period. After the release of the Notice of Preparation, the CPUC and BLM announced a series of public scoping meetings and a public scoping period under CEQA (September 15 to October 20, 2006). The comment period allowed the public and regulatory agencies an opportunity to comment on the scope of the environmental document, comment on the alternatives considered, and to identify issues that should be addressed in the EIR/EIS.

Additional Scoping Regarding Alternatives. Additional public meetings will be conducted in early 2007 to allow for public and agency input on the Proposed Project alternatives. Notices of these meetings will be mailed in January 2007. Another scoping report will be prepared after completion of these public meetings and will be available for public review.

1.1 Purpose of Scoping

The process of determining the focus and content of the EIR/EIS is known as scoping. Scoping helps to identify the range of actions, alternatives, environmental effects, and mitigation measures to be analyzed in depth, and eliminates from detailed study those issues that are not pertinent to the final decision on the Proposed Project. The scoping process is not intended to resolve differences of opinion regarding the Proposed Project or evaluate its merits. Instead, the process allows all interested parties to express their concerns regarding the Proposed Project and thereby ensures that all opinions and comments are considered in the environmental analysis. Scoping is an effective way to bring together and address the concerns of the public, affected agencies, and other interested parties. Members of the public, relevant federal, State, regional and local agencies, interests groups, community organizations, and other interested parties may participate in the scoping process by providing comments or recommendations regarding issues to be investigated in the EIR/EIS.

Comments received during the scoping process are part of the public record as documented in this scoping report. The comments and questions received during the public scoping process have been reviewed and considered by the CPUC and BLM in determining the appropriate scope of issues to be addressed in the EIR/EIS.

The purpose of the scoping for SRPL was to:

- Inform the public and relevant public agencies about the SRPL Project, CEQA and NEPA requirements, and the environmental impact analysis process;
- Identify potentially significant environmental impacts for consideration in the EIR/EIS;
- Identify possible mitigation measures for consideration in the EIR/EIS;
- Identify alternatives to the SRPL Project for evaluation in the EIR/EIS; and
- Compile a mailing list of public agencies and individuals interested in future project meetings and notices.

1.2 Summary of SRPL Project

SDG&E proposes transmission line and facility upgrades in San Diego and Imperial Counties. The entire Project would span a total of 150 miles (676 new towers), including a 91-mile 500-kilovolt (kV) transmission line (in Imperial County and eastern San Diego County) and a new 59-mile 230 kV line (in central and western San Diego County) that includes both overhead and underground segments. It would also include a new substation in central San Diego County and upgrades at four existing substations. The Project includes five segments or links as follows:

- **Imperial Valley Link** – This 61-mile segment would start at SDG&E's Imperial Valley Substation (near the City of El Centro) and end at the eastern boundary of Anza-Borrego Desert State Park (ABDSP). This route would include 204 new 500 kV towers, new access roads, and for a portion of the route, a new 200-foot right of way (ROW).
- **Anza-Borrego Link** – This link would include 22.6 miles through ABDSP. This segment would include 141 new structures on an existing 100-foot-wide ROW, which would require an additional 50-feet of ROW. This link would affect 43 acres of land currently designated as State Wilderness.
- **Central Link** – This 27.3-mile route would begin on the western boundary of ABDSP, to the Central East Substation (a new substation proposed as part of this Project), and then continue south-southwest on the east side of SR-78. This link would include 156 new towers (both 500 and 230 kV) within a new 200- to 300-foot-wide ROW.
- **Inland Valley Link** – This link would extend from Santa Ysabel, south of central Ramona, and end at the existing Sycamore Canyon Substation on the north edge of MCAS Miramar. The route would include 125 230 kV structures. South of Ramona, a portion of the transmission line would be placed underground.
- **Coastal Link** – This 13.6-mile link would begin at the existing Sycamore Canyon Substation and end at the existing Peñasquitos Substation in the Torrey Hills area of the City of San Diego. This segment would include 48 new structures and a 5.9-mile underground portion (west of Chicarita Substation).

1.3 Scoping Report Organization

This scoping report includes four main sections and appendices, as described below:

- Section 1 provides an introduction to the report and describes the purpose of scoping and a brief overview of the SRPL Project.

- Section 2 provides information on the scoping meeting and notification materials, including the Notice of Preparation and Notice of Intent.
- Section 3 summarizes the comments received and issues raised during the scoping comment period.
- Section 4 describes the next steps in the EIR/EIS process.
- Appendices consist of all the supporting materials used during scoping as well as copies of comment letters received on SRPL. The appendices include copies of the Notice of Preparation, Notice of Intent, and meeting materials provided at the public scoping meetings.

2. Project Scoping

This section describes the methods used to notify the public and agencies about the scoping process conducted for SRPL. It outlines how information was made available for public and agency review and identifies the different avenues available for providing comments on the Project (meetings, fax, email, mail, and phone).

2.1 Notice of Intent

To comply with NEPA 40 CFR 1501.7, the BLM published in the Federal Register a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare a joint EIR/EIS for the SRPL Project (FR Vol. 71, No. 169, page 51848, August 31, 2006). The NOI serves as the official legal notice that a federal agency is commencing preparation of an EIS. The Federal Register serves as the United States Government's official noticing and reporting publication. Similar to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), the NOI initiates the public scoping for the EIR/EIS, provides information about the Proposed Project, and serves as an invitation for other federal agencies granted cooperating agency status to provide comments on the scope and content of the EIR/EIS (see Appendix A).

2.2 Notice of Preparation

As required by CEQA Guidelines §15082, the CPUC issued a NOP on September 15, 2006, that summarized the SRPL Project, stated its intention to prepare a joint EIR/EIS, and requested comments from interested parties (See Appendix A). The NOP also included notice of the public scoping meetings that were held on October 2, 3, 4, and 5, 2006 in El Centro, Ramona, Borrego Springs, and San Diego, respectively. The NOP was filed with the State Clearinghouse on September 15, 2006 (SCH #2006091071), which began the 30-day public scoping period. The review period for the NOP ended on October 20, 2006.

Over 6,600 copies of the NOP were distributed to federal, State, regional, and local agencies; elected officials; and the general public. The mailing included the following approximate distribution:

- 236 agency representatives and area planning groups (includes over 65 different agencies)
- 52 environmental groups/organizations
- 64 tribal government representatives
- 41 elected officials
- 6,208 private citizens and other interested parties (including property owners within 300 feet of the Project corridor)

In addition, eighteen additional copies of the NOP were delivered to the local repository sites. The NOP and SRPL-related documents are available for review at the following repository sites:

Table 1. Repository Sites

Repository Sites	Address and Phone
Imperial County – Public Libraries and BLM Office	
Brawley Public Library	400 Main Street, Brawley, CA (760) 344-1891
Calexico Public Library	850 Encinas Avenue, Calexico, CA (760) 339-2470
El Centro Public Library	539 West State Street, El Centro, CA (760) 337-4565
Imperial Public Library	200 West 9th Street, Imperial, CA (760) 355-1332
BLM – El Centro Field Office	1661 South 4th Street, El Centro, CA (760) 337-4400
San Diego County – Public Libraries and CPUC Office	
Alpine Branch Library	2130 Arnold Way, Alpine, CA (619) 445-4221
Borrego Springs Public Library	571A Palm Canyon Drive, Borrego Springs, CA (760) 767-5761
Campo-Morena Village Branch Library	31356 Highway 94, Campo, CA (619) 478-5945
Carmel Mountain Ranch Library	12095 World Trade Drive, San Diego, CA (858) 538-8181
Descanso Branch Library	9545 River Drive, Descanso, CA (619) 445-5279
El Cajon Branch Library	201 East Douglas, El Cajon, CA (619) 588-3718
Jacumba Branch Library	44605 Old Highway 80, Jacumba, CA (619) 766-4608
Julian Branch Library	1850 Highway 78, Julian, CA (760) 765-0370
Lakeside Branch Library	9839 Vine Street, Lakeside, CA (619) 443-1811
Pine Valley Branch Library	28804 Old Highway 80, Pine Valley, CA (619) 473-8022
Potrero Branch Library	24883 Potrero Valley Road, Potrero, CA (619) 478-5978
Poway Public Library	13137 Poway Road, Poway, CA (858) 513-2900
Ramona Public Library	1406 Montecito Road, Ramona, CA (760) 738-2434
Rancho Peñasquitos Library	13330 Salmon River Road, San Diego, CA (858) 538-8159
San Diego City Central Library	820 E Street, San Diego, CA (858) 484-4440
Scripps Miramar Ranch Library	10301 Scripps Lake Drive, San Diego, CA (858) 538-8158
Spring Valley Branch Library	836 Kempton Street, Spring Valley, CA (619) 463-3006
CPUC – San Diego Office	1350 Front Street, Room 4006, San Diego, CA (619) 525-4217
Other Government Offices	
BLM – North Palm Springs Field Office	690 West Garnet Avenue, North Palm Springs, CA (760) 251-4849
CPUC – Los Angeles Office	320 West 4th Street, Suite 500, Los Angeles, CA (213) 576-7000
CPUC – San Francisco Office	505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2103, San Francisco, CA (415) 703-2074

2.3 Public Scoping Meetings

The CPUC and BLM held seven public scoping meetings in five locations in California on October 2, 3, 4, and 5. The scoping meetings provided an opportunity for the public and government agencies to obtain more information on the SRPL Project, to learn more about the CEQA and NEPA processes, to ask questions regarding the SRPL Project, and to provide formal comments on the SRPL Project.

Meeting Locations and Handouts

The seven scoping meetings were held at the locations and on the dates specified on Table 2. Handouts and informational materials available at each meeting are listed below. Refer to Appendices A and B for copies of these materials.

- Notice of Preparation
- PowerPoint Presentation
- Self-Addressed Speaker Comment Sheet
- Speaker Registration Card

Other information was also made available for public review, which included a copy of the Proponent's Environmental Assessment and large-scale maps of the Project alignment.

A court reporter was used at each meeting to record all oral comments presented at the meetings. Appendix D-4 presents the transcripts for each of the public scoping meetings. In addition, the CPUC and BLM provided Spanish translation services at the El Centro and Borrego Springs meetings in the event that such services were needed.

Table 2. Public Scoping Meetings

Date and Time	Meeting Location	Sign-Ins	Oral Comments	Written Comments
Monday October 2, 2006 4:30 pm to 8:00 pm	El Centro Imperial County Board of Supervisors 940 West Main St. Suite 219 El Centro, CA 92243	23	12	7
Tuesday October 3, 2006 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm	Ramona Charles Nunn Performing Arts Center 1521 Hanson Lane Ramona, CA 92065	43 (total) 28 15	17 (total) 11 6	7 (total) 4 3
Wednesday October 4, 2006 2:00 pm to 4:30 pm 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm	Borrego Springs Borrego Springs Resort 1112 Tilting T Drive Borrego Springs, CA 92004	101 (total) 54 47	35 (total) 14 21	11 (total) 8 3
Thursday October 5, 2006 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm	San Diego – Mission Valley Hilton Hotel 901 Camino Del Rio S San Diego, CA 92108	57	22	3
Thursday October 5, 2006 6:30 pm to 9:00 pm	San Diego – Rancho Peñasquitos Doubletree Golf Resort 14455 Peñasquitos Drive San Diego, CA 92129	40	19	3
	Totals	264	105	31

Newspaper Advertisements

The dates and locations of the public scoping meetings were advertised in eight local newspapers. Two of the ads were published in Spanish in the *Adelante Valle* and *El Latino* newspapers. The advertisements provided a brief synopsis of the Project and encouraged attendance at the meetings to share comments on the Project. The meeting advertisements were placed in the newspapers presented in Table 3 (also see Appendix B-1).

Table 3. Newspaper Advertisements

Publication	Advertisement Date
Imperial Valley Press	Friday, Sept. 15, 2006
North County Times (Coastal and Inland)	Friday, Sept. 15, 2006
San Diego Union Tribune	Friday, Sept. 15, 2006
San Diego Business Journal	Monday, Sept. 18, 2006
Adelante Valle (Spanish)	Thursday, Sept. 21, 2006
Borrego Sun	Thursday, Sept. 21, 2006
Ramona Sentinel	Thursday, Sept. 21, 2006
El Latino (Spanish)	Friday, Sept. 22, 2006

Agency and Tribal Government Consultation

Several key federal, State, and local agencies were contacted by phone to provide information on the Project and to determine interest in face-to-face meetings to discuss the Project. These agencies were sent the NOP that described the key components of the Project. As of mid-November, ten agencies (listed below) requested meetings as part of the agency consultation. The comments received during the face-to-face consultations are summarized in Appendix C-5.

- County of Imperial, Planning Department
- Cleveland National Forest
- California State Parks – Anza-Borrego Desert State Park
- County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
- Marine Corps Air Station Miramar
- El Centro Naval Air Station
- City of San Diego, Community Development Department
- San Diego Regional Energy Office
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
- Vista Irrigation District

BLM initiated the government-to-government consultation process under *Executive Memorandum of April 29, 1994*, contacting tribal government via a letter distributed by certified mail on July 6 and 10, 2006 (see Appendix E). The purpose of the letter was to notify tribal governments of the SRPL Project and inquire if any tribal governments were interested in initiating government-to-government consultation regarding the SRPL Project pursuant to *Executive Memorandum of April 29, 1994*. Responses received to date from tribal governments are presented in Appendix E.

2.4 Outreach

The CPUC and BLM also provided opportunities for the public and agencies to ask questions or comment on the SRPL Project outside of the meetings. A public hotline, email address, and website were established and available during the public comment period. Information on these additional outreach efforts are described below.

Project Information Hotline

In order to offer another opportunity to inquire about the scoping meetings or the SRPL Project, a hotline [(866) 711-3106] was established to take oral comments and questions from those unable to attend the meetings. Telephone messages were retrieved daily and all calls were responded to within a 48-hour period. The hotline also served as a fax line to allow for comments to be submitted by fax instead of mail. Comments received through this hotline (voice or fax) have been considered and incorporated in this report.

Email Address

An email address was established for the SRPL Project (sunrise@aspeneg.com) to provide another means of submitting comments on the scope of the EIR/EIS. The email address was provided on meeting handouts and posted on the website. Comments received by email have been considered and incorporated in this report.

Internet Website

Information about the SRPL Project was made available through the Project website hosted by the CPUC. During the September/October 2006 scoping period, the website included electronic versions of the Project application, NOP, and Project-related maps and thus provided another public venue to learn about the Project. The website will remain a public resource for the Project and will announce future public meetings and hearings. The website address is:

http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/aspen/sunrise/sunrise.htm

3. Scoping Comments

This section summarizes the comments raised by the public and agencies during the scoping process for the SRPL EIR/EIS. This summary is based upon both written and oral comments that were received during the scoping review period, which officially extended from August 31, 2006 (release of the NOI) to October 20, 2006. All written and oral comments received during the public comment period, during the public scoping meetings, through the phone line (voice/fax), and through email were reviewed for this report and for the EIR/EIS. Section 3.1 summarizes the comments in relation to the human environment, physical environment, and SRPL Project alternatives. Section 3.2 references Appendix C, which summarizes all written and oral comments received during the scoping period.

Over one hundred (100) individuals presented oral comments during the scoping meetings, and 218 comment letters were submitted during the scoping process. In addition, form letters from 27 individuals and a petition signed by 187 people were submitted. In addition to private individuals, thirteen government agencies, thirty-six private organizations, and one tribal government submitted written comments

Government Agencies and Special Districts

- California Department of Fish and Game
- California Department of Parks and Recreation
- California Department of Transportation
- California State Water Resources Board
- Cleveland National Forest

- Imperial County Air Pollution Control Board
- Imperial County Planning and Development Services
- Imperial Irrigation District Water Department
- City of Poway
- City of San Diego
- County of San Diego
- San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park (Joint Powers Authority)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Private Organizations and Companies

- Anza-Borrego Foundation and Institute
- Atma Jyoti Ashram
- Border Power Plant Group/Ratepayers for Affordable Clean Energy
- Boulevard Sponsor Group
- California Farm Bureau Federation
- California Native Plant Society
- California Overland Desert Excursions
- California State Parks Foundation
- California Wilderness Coalition
- Carmel Valley Community Planning Board
- Carmel Valley Neighborhood 10 North HOA
- Center for Biological Diversity
- Community Alliance for Sensible Energy (CASE)
- Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Group
- Descanso Planning Group
- Golightly Farms
- Imperial County Dairy Attraction Committee
- Imperial County Farm Bureau
- LS Power Generation (Goodin, MacBride, Squeri, Ritchie & Day)
- Mussey Grade Road Alliance
- Natural Resources Defense Council
- Ocotillo Wells Citizens Alliance for Responsible Energy
- Pacific Crest Trail Association
- Pardee Homes
- Park Village Maintenance Assessment
- Palomar Observatory
- Pine Valley Community Planning Group
- Poway Democratic Club
- Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens
- San Diego Chapter Sierra Club
- San Diego Renewable Energy Society, American Solar Energy Society
- Santa Ysabel Ranch
- Spangler Peak Ranch
- Starlight Mountain Estates Owners (SMEO)
- Utility Consumer's Action Network (UCAN)
- West Chase Homeowners Association

Tribal Governments (through Scoping and Government-to-Government Consultation)

- Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians (3 letters)
- Pala Band of Mission Indians

3.1 Key Issues Raised during the Public Comment Period

As discussed above, written and oral comments were provided by members of the public, organizations, and government agencies. The discussion below presents the key issues identified from the written and oral comments received on the Project. The specific issues raised during the public scoping process are summarized according to the following topics and issue areas:

- Human Environment Issues and Concerns
- Physical Environment Issues and Concerns
- Alternatives
- Environmental Review and Decision-Making Process

3.1.1 Human Environment Issues and Concerns

Some public comments focused on the potential effect of the Project on the human environment, including conflicts with existing land uses, impacts to property values, safety and fire risk issues, noise, construction impacts, and health and safety impacts of electric and magnetic fields (EMFs) from increased EMF emissions.

Conflicts with Existing Land Uses

One of the most significant land use issues expressed both in the public meetings and through the written comment letters was the proposed use of public lands for the proposed and alternative routes. The concerns centered on the use of ABDSP (proposed route) and Cleveland National Forest land (potential alternative route) for the project. California State Parks, environmental organizations, and community groups were strongly opposed to the use of ABDSP for the project. These groups requested the identification and evaluation of alternative routes that would avoid use of Park lands. Commenters emphasized the need to preserve public lands and protect the natural quality of the park. Another major concern is the proposed project's location within State Wilderness and the required re-designation of wilderness land to allow relocation of the existing corridor within ABDSP to avoid a cultural site. Other concerns were focused on the project's potential to impact recreational uses in the Park because of its close proximity to campgrounds and the open camping policy.

The Forest Service has expressed its concern with the use of Forest Service land for the project (as a potential alternative route) and identified the potential need for a plan amendment to accommodate the project outside of a designated utility corridor, has identified roadless designation areas along the route, and expressed its concern with the threat of wildfires.

A number of residents expressed concern with the placement of towers near their homes and the impact it would have on the use of their property. The Carmel Valley, Rancho Peñasquitos, and Del Mar Mesa communities felt that they were unusually burdened by the addition of additional towers and lines in their neighborhood. Some of the homeowner groups requested that the transmission line be placed underground in their neighborhoods. They felt that undergrounding in some neighborhoods and not others was unfair.

Another key land use issue was the potential for the project to discourage the development of dairy farms in Imperial County. Imperial County and private foundations such as the Farm Bureau and Dairy Attraction Committee felt that the project would have a negative impact on the Committee's ability to attract more dairies, which is a County goal. Commenters believe that the transmission lines would be detrimental to the dairy industry, and would have significant impacts on operation of an existing dairy.

Impacts to Property Values and Other Socioeconomic issues

Residents expressed concern about how the SRPL Project would affect the value of their property. Residents stated that realtors had confirmed that the value of their property would decrease if additional lines or new lines were placed near their homes. To address this issue some commenters felt that the environmental document should consider the impacts to property values. In rural low-income areas of the route there was concern that they were being asked to accept additional transmission lines and asked that the EIR/EIS evaluate environmental justice issues in detail.

For some communities along the route, tourism is one of the key industries. In Borrego Springs there is a concern that the project or an alternative through the Park would negatively impact the tourism industry. For other communities, there was a concern that the project would have social and economic impacts to communities along the route, such as decreased tourism, reduced home buying, and reduced level of agricultural development.

Fire Risk and EMF

The Forest Service and property owners near the proposed and existing transmission corridor were concerned with the potential for wildfires and fire management. Commenters wanted thorough analysis of how the SRPL Project could contribute to fires and felt that having the project close to their homes or to areas of dense vegetation such as preserve lands and ABDSP made their community more susceptible to fires. In addition, there was concern that the power lines would be an obstruction to low-flying planes, which would present another significant safety risk to neighborhoods near the transmission corridor.

Another expressed concern was the potential health and safety-related issues resulting from increased EMF emissions, especially in those neighborhoods where additional towers and lines would be placed within an existing corridor. Commenters were concerned with significant health risks associated with prolonged exposure to increased high voltage electric fields near their properties, including EMF effects on dairy production.

Noise

Some commenters also expressed concern with the noise associated with transmission towers and asked that noise be sufficiently evaluated in the EIR/EIS. For residents near the transmission towers there was a concern that the addition of new towers would significantly increase the amount of corona noise to adjacent homes.

3.1.2 Physical Environment Issues and Concerns

Commenters expressed concerns with the potential impacts that the SRPL Project may have on the physical environment, particularly to biological resources. Comments are summarized below.

Biological Resources Issues

There were significant concerns from resource agencies and environmental groups that the project would have significant impacts to biological resources within ABDSP and in areas covered by the San Diego Multiple-Species Conservation Program. The project has the potential to impact native plants and bighorn sheep, raptors, gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and southwestern Willow flycatcher and their habitats. Commenters have asked that a thorough evaluation of biological resources be conducted in order to effectively mitigate potential impacts to biological resources. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has requested that protocol surveys for sensitive species be completed prior to release of the Draft EIR/EIS to ensure that biological resource issues are effectively addressed and mitigated in the draft document.

3.1.3 Alternatives

As noted earlier in this report, over 100 individuals presented oral comments on the project and 218 written comments, plus 27 form letters and a petition with 187 signatures, were received during the scoping period. There were a substantial number of suggested alternatives received from agencies, private organizations, and citizens. Table 4 is intended to provide a broad sampling of the alternatives suggested. Many comments included location-specific routing suggestions that, while not shown here, will also be considered in EIR/EIS alternatives screening. Please refer to Appendices C and D for more detail.

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Victor Carrillo, Imperial County Air Pollution Control Board	Agency	NW	• Supports renewable energy projects that meet applicable emissions standards. • Take into account the health of Imperial Valley and border region residents.
San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority (JPA)	Agency	R	• Proposes route along western edge of Santa Ysabel Open Space Preserve and along land recently purchased by the JPA for the San Dieguito River Park with public funds. • Underground the towers west of SR-79. • Site the poles west of SR-79 along the toe of slope so that they are less visible against the hillside backdrop. • Consolidate the existing lines with the new route and remove old poles along SR-79.
Therese O'Rourke and Michael Milligan, USFWS and CDFG	Agency	NW	• Ensure renewable resources can supply both Sunrise and Green Path. • Evaluate non-transmission alternatives.
Tina Terrell, Cleveland National Forest	Agency	R	• CNF's only designated corridor is on Table 485, located on page 14 of Part 2 of the revised Plan; any other location would require a Plan Amendment. • Gives reasons to avoid the following areas: Sunrise Scenic Byway (County Road S1), I-8, Guatay Mountain area, Sheeps Head near Glenn Cliff, Hauser and Pine Creek Wilderness Areas, Valle de San Jose Grant, Santa Ysabel Valley, Witch Creek area, San Vicente Valley, two golden eagle nesting areas.
Elizabeth Haven, State Water Resources Control Board	Agency	General	• Include alternatives analysis required by CWA 404(b)(1) Guidelines.

[1] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Michael Wells, California Department of Parks and Recreation	Agency	R	• Find route around ABDSP and specifically one or more routes south of the Park in the vicinity of the I-8 corridor. • Fine-tune B, C, and D to minimize land use conflicts. • Move Route D slightly east, reducing take of residential property without impacting Federal Wilderness. The multi-use mission of CNF should allow for an easement in CNF near its western boundary. • Alternatives should not be rejected due to eminent domain or conflicts with land use/management plans (e.g., CNF General Plan).
Chandra Wallar, County of San Diego	Agency	NW, S, R	• Evaluate power generating alternatives, Million Solar Roofs Plan, and other solutions for clean energy in keeping with the Regional Energy Strategy. • Look at routes to the far north outside of San Diego County and far southern portion of the County. • Co-locate portions of the line with I-8 in strategically selected locations to avoid visual impacts in areas such as Buckman Springs Valley and Cameron Station or near the existing SWPL along the border. • Follow the existing ROW alignment through Santa Ysabel. • Underground the entire segment that goes through Mount Gower Preserve.
Jurg Heuberger, Imperial County Planning and Development Services	Agency	NW	• Solar power and wind power are not proven technologies and the County has not received any applications for either. • "Eastern Route" could have dairy farm impacts.
Robert Manis, City of San Diego	Agency	R[2]	• Route through developed or developing areas rather than MHPA (multi-habitat planning area)…if no other routes are possible then follow previously existing roads, easements, ROWs, and disturbed areas • Does not support Coastal Link nor any alternatives that would impact vernal pools • Continue underground in Park Village Dr (beyond N72A and N72B) rather than through Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve
Mickey Cafagna, City of Poway	Agency	R	• Route should use roadways and utility easements, away from residences, and be underground to reduce cumulative EMF impacts with existing lines in the Poway area.
Harlan Pinto and Will Micklin, Ewiiaapaayp Tribal Office and Ewiiaapaayp Band of Kumeyaay Indians	Tribal Government	R	• Route near I-8 would allow access to multiple wind generation developments near Mount Laguna, 12 miles north of SWPL.
Wally Besuden, Spangler Peak Ranch, Inc.	Org	R	• Avoid Creelman Lane because of planned residential and recreational development; otherwise, underground from San Diego Estates through Creelman Lane.

[2] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Albert and Kathleen Cauzza, Santa Ysabel Ranch	Org	R	• Avoid Santa Ysabel Valley or place it underground.
Keith Ritchey, West Chase Homeowners Association (WCHOA)	Org	R[3] (map attached)	• Route within SR-56 may have been considered by SDG&E but appears to have not been because SDG&E said Caltrans would not allow it (see Alt 2 below). Alternative Routes (west to east): • General – Start just past the west end of Park Village Road (N33B, MP 146.7) • Alternative Route 1 (Carmel Valley Rd) – starts at end of Park Village Rd and would join existing overhead lines and run north approx 2.2 miles until it reaches Carmel Valley Rd at Via Alberta. It would run northeast for ~2.7 mi under median of 110-ft-wide Carmel Valley Rd until just east of Black Mountain Rd. It would then transition back to overhead and run 2.3 mi southeast to Chicarita Sub (Prefer this 2nd) • Alternative Route 2 (SR-56) – Travel 1.9 mi on existing overhead lines to SR-56 where it would transition to underground for ~3.5 mi east within SR-56 property limits. It could transition from the edge of the roadway initially to the center divide at eh bridge located about 0.1 mi east of the overhead wires and 0.6 mi west of Camino del Sur and then continue in the median. It would have to cross additional bridges at Camino del Sur and 0.7 mi east of Camino del Sur and then move under Peñasquitos Blvd at SR-56 overpass. It would then continue 0.3 miles south on Peñasquitos Blvd to Chicarita. (Prefer this the most) • Alternative Route 3 (Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve and Mercy Rd) – Travels underground south from end of Park Village Road and turns east following SDG&E's proposed route until it turns towards Park Village Rd near Darkwood Dr. Then this route would continue through the Preserve for ~2 miles to the end of Canyonside Park Dr. It would then continue ~0.6 mi east under Canyonside Park Dr to Black Mountain Rd. It would turn south under Black Mountain Rd to Mercy Rd where the underground line would turn east and continue under Mercy Rd for 1.3 miles to the I-15 overpass. Mercy Rd then changes names and the line would continue under Scripps-Poway Pkwy for another 0.9 miles to the vicinity of Ivy Hill Dr where it would transition to overhead and join the lines coming from Sycamore Canyon Substation (Prefer this 3rd over SDG&E's route).
Johanna Wald, Natural Resources Defense Council	Org	R	• Alternatives avoid ABDSP (submitted PHC by CA Dept of Parks and Rec) with similar specific adjustments to minimize impacts.
Mary Aldern, Community Alliance for Sensible Energy	Org	NW, S	• More fully explore Green Path Phase 1 (not phase 2 or 3). • Look at UCAN's suggested alternative involving reconductor of a short segment across the Mexican border. • Energy efficiency, new ocean wave technology, municipal solarization of public buildings • Keep alternative transmission routes along already developed places if line is to be constructed at all.
Joe Raffetto, California Overland Desert Excursions	Org	R	• Put lines along I-8.

[3] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Kay Stewart, California Native Plant Society	Org	R	• Avoid dedicated vernal pool conservation lands north of Rancho Peñasquitos Preserve.
Laura Copic, Carmel Valley Community Planning Board	Org	S, R	• Underground new lines from N33B (MP 146.7) to N34 (MP 149.9) at Peñasquitos Sub (3.3 miles). • Evaluate newer HTLS cables and further consolidation of the line. • Install all existing lines underground (69 kV, 138 kV, 230 kV). • Remove the lattice towers and H-frames from the segment. • Ensure that the underground route is continuous with the proposed underground segment to the east and that the power lines remain completely underground from point N29 (MP 142.3) until Peñasquitos Substation.
Sara Feldman, California State Parks Foundation	Org	R, NW	• Look at southern alternative routes along I-8 (i.e., avoid ABDSP) • "No Wire" Alternative
Michele Ritchey, West Chase Homeowners Association	Org	R	• Route to avoid homes. • Install in roadways and major thoroughfares. In Rancho Peñasquitos that would be in SR-56 or Carmel Valley Rd (could use the road median).
Donna Tisdale, Boulevard Sponsor Group	Org	NW, S, G	• Energy conservation • Co-generation • Solar roofs • New technology to reconductor existing transmission line to carry more energy. • Use the money on helping homes and businesses retrofit with dual-pane windows, insulation, solar roofs, and to replace old light fixtures and appliances with newer energy efficient versions to conserve energy.
Swami Satyananda, Atma Jyoti Ashram	Org	R	• Routes around ABDSP, i.e., use the I-8 corridor
Joanne Fogel, Carmel Valley Neighborhood 10 North HOA (Carmel Country Highlands)	Org	R, S[4]	• Underground all the lines. • Claims that undergrounding HVDC Light technology is not much more costly depending on local conditions per ASEA Brown Boveri/ABB (website listed and article included).
Peter Babich, Poway Democratic Club	Org	NW	• Renewable energy generation projects.

[4] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Bill Powers, Border Power Plant Working Group and Ratepayers for Affordable Clean Energy (RACE)	Org	NW, S, R, G	• Look at "full loop" and incorporate into impacts. • Look at IEPR comments that weren't incorporated (attached to scoping letter). • Address expansion of transmission line options if reliability is addressed by other means: — Addition of 250 MW of peaking turbines by 2008 proposed by SDG&E to CPUC — Revision of G-1 to reflect ability of Palomar and Otay Mesa to operate with steam turbine trip, adding 232 MW of in-basin power generation. • Address impediments to locating SRPL with SWPL if there is no reliability justification with SRPL. • Reconductor existing 230 kV lines with HTLS lines from Miguel to Mission and Sycamore Substations to eliminate congestion as an obstacle to running a 2nd SWPL into Miguel Substation • Address likelihood of HTLS being commercially available in 2010-2015 timeframe as an alternative to 2nd SWPL • Why LADWP-IID Green Path not adequate alone to (1) move Imperial Valley renewables (2) address congestion concerns along SWPL • Import from AZ power plants using low cost natural gas (stated benefit in 2015) but R.04-01-025 Phase I scheduled LNG to enter SoCal Gas pipeline in 2008, so SRPL is justified after 2008. • The two 230 kV lines in Mexico are equipped with 69 kV taps at the substations, which is ideal for renewable energy project but not included in the Proposed Project. • Upgrade Path 45. • $300 to $400 million power plant (600-800 MW) in San Diego instead of transmission line. • Green Path has fewer impacts and could be substitute. • 2nd SWPL or in 230 kV corridor in Mexico.
Brian Cragg, Goodin, MacBride, Squeri, Ritchie & Day (attorneys for LS Power)	Org	NW, G	• Include an in-area generation alternative. Couple in-basin generation with means to meet renewable goals.

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
David Hogan and Paul Blackburn, Conservation Groups (Center for Biological Diversity and Sierra Club)	Org	NW, S	• Compliance with State's Loading Order, RPS, global climate change laws, requirements related to minimizing cost will require adoption of no-wires alternative (efficiency, conservation, Demand Side Management, in-basin renewable generation, other low impact technologies ("Smart Grid") • Reevaluate potential for renewable energy development in Imperial Valley with regard to rate of development and maximum amount of development possible within CPUC planning horizon. • Evaluate alternatives using methods of meeting energy demand, using loading order energy supplies first to see if it would meet those objectives (favors a combination of means). • If shown necessary to build transmission line then look at route alternatives alongside major existing lines (SWPL and in Mexico) and/or transportation corridors (I-8) outside of ABDSP. • New 230 kV lines located primarily in Mexico by Comision Federal de Electricidad (CFE) between Imperial Valley and Miguel Substations. • Joint IID and LADWP proposed as part of IID's full Green Path Project (Green Path North). • Four new 230 kV circuits (as opposed to one 500 kV line) either overhead or underground from Imperial Valley Substation into San Diego County. • Upgrades to existing transmission line through use of high-capacity, low-sag wires. • Better integration of SDG&E, CFE, and SCE grids to improve increased reliability for all utilities. • Reinforce the SDG&E internal transmission grid to increase its internal flow capacity and reliability, particularly in light of age and condition of some older transmission lines. • Supports UCAN's additional alternatives. • Underground lines through areas of high scenic value (e.g., ABDSP, Mesa Grande, San Felipe Valley, Santa Ysabel Valley, portions visible from the Coyote Mountains Wilderness, Fish Creek Mountain Wilderness, and any other protected lands). • Would harm environment by promoting renewable facility development in: San Felipe Valley (wind); Ocotillo Wells Vehicular Recreation Area (geothermal, wind, solar); McCain Valley (wind); Borrego Valley (wind, solar, geothermal); Jacumba/Boulevard/ Campo region (wind) and Imperial Valley (solar, wind, geothermal, trash burner, sludge burner facilities).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Diane Conklin, Mussey Grade Road Alliance	Org	NW, S, R, G[5]	• System Alternative would include: — Aggressive energy efficiency program (see scoping letter for more detail) — Aggressive demand response program — Residential cool-roof program (see letter for more detail) — Residential and commercial passive solar buildings design program — Rooftop solar generation — In-area generation — Distributed generation • Use local existing and planned power plants. • Expand the capacity of existing transmission line, including SWPL by using HTLS aluminum conductors/reconductor. • Replace SWPL or cables with DC transmission with converter station at Miguel Substation. • Transmit power from Mexicali plants and new sources in Imperial Valley to Tijuana inside Mexico, using and adding capacity to existing 230 kV circuits that connect Mexicali to Tijuana, then connect to CA using/adding capacity to existing Tijuana–San Diego 230 kV intertie. • Encourage enhanced energy conservation measures, including real-time metering, greater use of daylighting technology, increased installation of solar PV sources on commercial buildings (e.g., malls and warehouses) and public buildings (e.g., schools and public buildings) by providing incentives for enhanced cooperation between governments, utilities, and building industry.

[5] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Harvey Payne, Rancho Peñasquitos Concerned Citizens	Org	R, S (map included)	• Transmission Upgrades (Coastal Link) • New line into Peñasquitos Substation is not needed and overload could be corrected with the following: — Place reactors in series with the three overloaded transformers (two 230/69 kV and one 230/69 kV transformer) at Sycamore Canyon Substation and add a 230 kV/69 kV transformer at Miguel Substation — Add a 230/138 kV transformer and a 230/69 kV transformer at Sycamore Canyon Sub and add a 230/69 kV transformer at Miguel Sub (similar to Option 2 in CAISO report) — Loop in one or both of the Mission-Miguel 230 kV lines into Sycamore Canyon Substation and add a 230/69 kV transformer at Miguel Substation. • Alternative Routes and Routing Adjustments: — Agrees that SDG&E "Northwest Corner Alternative" and "Mannix-Dormouse Rd Alternative" have greater environmental impacts. — 1a. Pomerado Rd to Miramar Area North – All Underground Alternative — 1b. Pomerado Rd to Miramar Area North – Combination Underground/Overhead Option — 2a. MCAS Miramar – All Underground Option — 2b. MCAS Miramar – Combination Underground/Overhead Option — 3. Mercy Road to Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve – Combination Underground/Overhead Option — 4. Rancho Peñasquitos Blvd Bike Path Adjustment — 5. Preferred route adjustments.
Park Village Maintenance Assessment District (PVMAD)	Org	R[6]	• Coastal Link between Black Mountain Road and Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve should be rerouted around PVMAD and the community at large.
Karen Mills, CA Farm Bureau Federation	Org	R	• Existing lines/ROWs in Central Link should be more fully explored.
Lisa Ross, Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Group	Org	R	• Underground in the area. • Use the SR-56 corridor. • Build a 2nd line along SDG&E's existing ROW along the southern San Diego border. • Any alternatives that would bypass Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Hills, Carmel Valley and Rancho Peñasquitos, and other protected open space habitat.
Community Alliance for Sensible Energy (CASE) Preliminary Scoping Comments	Org	R, S	• Four new 230 kV circuits as opposed to a 500 kV is possible (it can be underground). • Discusses why all alternative routes through the allied communities would be bad.

[6] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Michael Page, Starlight Mountain Estates Owners (SMEO)	Org	R (map included)	• Extend the proposed underground facilities currently ending at N77 (MP 117.2, structure I90) approximately 0.6 mi to the northeast, thereby moving the transition to overhead to the end of the valley (proposed structure I93). The route would continue from the point it first enters SMEO private property (approx structure I125) and continue to follow the road (not going to N77/MP 117.2) northeast from the gate until it reaches the paved portion of Oak Hollow Rd. Then it would follow Oak Hollow Rd until turning east across pasture, joining an existing service road and the 69 kV ROW until structure I93. • Consolidate and relocate the existing 69 kV overhead facility within the new SMEO proposed route.
Nicole Rothfleisch, Imperial County Farm Bureau	Org	R[7]	• See Richard vanLeeuwen above. • This area of Imperial Valley is designated for additional dairy relocation.
Ryan Henson, California Wilderness Coalition	Org	R	• Require SDG&E to follow a route along paved roads and use existing utility corridors (lists wilderness areas that should be avoided along PEA routes).
Richard vanLeeuwen, Bullfrog Farms	Org	R (map included)	• Avoid this farming area of Imperial Valley by at least 5 miles (earlier proposed routes showed the line farther away).
Richard Jenson, Ocotillo Wells Citizens Alliance for Responsible Energy	Org	NW, G	• Supports low-impact, non-wires alternatives from in-basin generation to energy conservation.
Michael Shames, Utility Consumer's Action Network	Org	R, NW	• Relocate Central substation to the San Felipe Substation site • Build 500 kV line roughly parallel to SWPL from IV Substation to the Boulevard/Campos area, then build 2 x 230 kV transmission from there to the existing SDG&E grid (possibly Sycamore Canyon), possibly at location in the El Cajon area along the existing Miguel-Mission and Miguel/Sycamore 230 kV lines. • Build a 500 kV line from Imperial County to the Los Angeles area as currently proposed by LADWP • Generation and system alternatives: — Mexico Light (140-300 MW) — "SONGS" Light (1000 MW) — G-1 rerate (232 MW) — AMI [Advanced Metering Initiative] (230-262 MW) — Demand Response Programs (29-143 Mw) — New Combustion Turbines (414 Mw) — South Bay Project (561-620 Mw)
Alvin Ruppert	Indiv	NW, S, G	• Expand existing lines. • Smaller local generation. • California Solar Initiative. • Energy efficiency (e.g., fluorescent lights).
Joetta Mihalovich	Indiv	R	• Underground through Scripps Ranch.
Glenn Smith	Indiv	R	• Use I-8 to avoid ABDSP.
Richard and Sara Radigan	Indiv	R	• Use property where there are existing lines and avoid commenters' property (27949 Highway 78, Ramona).
Grazyna Krajewska	Indiv	NW, G	• SB-1 Million Solar Roofs. • Use distributed local energy instead.

[7] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Debra Oestreich	Indiv	R	• Go along existing 69 kV route in Ramona area (SDG&E staff said it is on federally-owned land).
Todd Eisenberg	Indiv	NW, S, R, G	• If goes forward, underground it. • Upgrade Encina and South Bay Plants. • Establish regional energy credits that would allow SDG&E to avoid building redundant transmission line while still getting credits for renewables. • Solar PV on roofs of new homes in San Diego County. • SWPL and 230 kV Mexico lines can carry all renewable power. • 500 kV LADWP-IID line more effective at moving renewables out of Imperial Valley.
Robert and Grace Clark	Indiv	R, NW	• Use existing route along I-8 or along SR-86 (Riverside County) to avoid ABDSP. • Fund energy conservation and solar technology with project budget.
Peter and Susan Suranyi	Indiv	R, S	• Use existing substations, electrical infrastructure, and ROWs.
Judith Withers, 27150 San Felipe Rd, Warner Springs	Indiv	NW, R (map with property included)	• Don't permit Central East Substation; instead, use existing substation on SR-79 • Use alternative route for incoming 500 kV line east of her property on Hwy S2. • Consider rooftop solar initiative.
Mary Manseau	Indiv	R	• Move line adjacent Westside Main Canal so not in mouth of Coyote Wash.
Curt Baldwin	Indiv	R	• Underground in Scripps Poway Parkway area.
Jerry Hughes	Indiv	R, NW/G	• Supports route along I-8, avoiding ABDSP. • Update current sources of energy generation.
Kristin Harms	Indiv	NW, S, G	• Better SDG&E programs for conservation, demand management, energy efficiency. • More local renewable energy, based on proven technology. • Replacement of current transmission lines with new ones that can conduct more electricity. • More local power generation. • Other less destructive transmission upgrades.
Kathy and Earl Pratt	Indiv	R[8]	• Use interstate highway corridors avoiding Tubb Canyon and ABDSP. • If necessary in ABDSP then minimize impacts to Borrego Springs and visitors.
Denis James	Indiv	NW, R, S, G	• Keep lines at the border. • Lines north through Warner Springs to LA and Riverside. • Use the I-8 corridor. • BLM OK'd line through Park but now they want a huge line. Let them keep the line already OK'd. • Repower and build new plants in San Diego area. • Solar panels on rooftops. • Look at the D route (in 3rd scoping letter). • Make one for the west to the ocean routes (in 3rd scoping letter).

[8] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
John and Phyllis Bremer	Indiv	R	• Avoid area north-northeast of Mesa Grande Road between markers N46 (MP 103.5) and N68 (MP 106.1)
Mark Bennett	Indiv	NW, S, G	• Better SDG&E programs for conservation, demand management, energy efficiency. • More local renewable energy based on proven technology. • Replace current transmission line with new wires that can conduct more electricity (e.g., SWPL or IID existing lines). • More local power generation.
Denis Trafecanty, Santa Ysabel	Indiv	NW, S, G	• Project and alternatives fulfillment of CA's global warming policies, especially if Stirling and/or other renewable projects are not completed in time. • Improve SDG&E programs for conservation, demand management, energy efficiency. • More local renewable energy based on proven technology. • Replace current transmission line with new wires that can conduct more electricity (e.g., SWPL or IID existing lines). • More local power generation.
Juli Zerbe	Indiv	R, G	• Generate power at the where it is used. • Have a direct route to the population centers. • If Santa Ysabel is used then underground it.
Kurt Livens	Indiv	R	• Keep it along the I-8.
Leslie Bellah	Indiv	R	• Follow existing lines from Imperial Valley to Miguel Substation.
Nancy Bailey	Indiv	R[9]	• Put lines along I-8.
Rebecca Falk	Indiv	NW, G	• Support and initiate funding for clean local projects.
Sita Antel	Indiv	NW, G	• Make existing power plants more efficient. • SDG&E should promote rooftop solar.
John Lindemann	Indiv	R	• Build along I-8.
Jim Bell	Indiv	NW	• See "Creating a Sustainable Economy and Future on our Planet".
Marsha Johnston	Indiv	NW	• Recycled energy from industrial processes and from electric generation as a means of demand reduction and optimizing generation.
Melody Herbert	Indiv	R (map included)	• Install line next to or in SR-56 (could even connect south to Scripps-Poway Pkwy). • Otherwise, move farther from homes and closer to bike lane.
Robert Nabours	Indiv	R	• Line should run in S2 and meet the existing substation at SR-79 and S2, as was originally proposed.
John Peterson	Indiv	R	• Southern route to Miguel Substation. • Route into Riverside County. • Undergrounding.
Joan and David Shannon	Indiv	NW	• Alternative power sources, such as solar energy.
John Bland	Indiv	R	• Relocate Central East Substation.
Paul and Kathy Jorgensen	Indiv	R	• Underground the line. • Install along existing highway corridors.
Donald Armentrout	Indiv	R	• Use the existing designated corridor across BLM lands.

[9] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Gary Hoyt	Indiv	R, S	• Underground the line. • Parallel 500 kV lines (i.e., SWPL) is counterproductive. • Assess more effective forms of carrying electricity.
Martin Meglasson	Indiv	NW	• Follow San Diego Regional Energy Strategy, Energy 2030 (2003), which emphasizes the need for local generation. • Refers to borderpowerplants.org for viable alternatives suggested by others.
Michelle Earnshaw, Ramona	Indiv	R	• Follow SWPL. • Underground the line in all areas.
Elsa Chambers	Indiv	R	• Underground the lines (concerned about ABDSP).
Mike and Jennifer Vildibill, Poway	Indiv	R (map included)	• Use existing roadway franchise and ROW. • Underground lines in Rolling Hills Community and Scripps Ranch – transition to underground on Pomerado Rd going north on Pomerado Rd to Scripps Poway Pkwy where they would go west about 1 mile where it would join overhead lines on Scripps-Poway Pkwy. Overhead-underground transitions are located where the overhead lines presently cross these two roads.
Albert and Korene Barron	Indiv	R[10]	• Build Proposed Project – use ABDSP and area northwest because less populated (i.e., avoid Boulevard).
Sandra Roberts	Indiv	R	• Avoid Tubb Canyon in Borrego Springs or underground it. • Route along I-8 or other busy areas. • Use LEAPS instead.
Ken Wright	Indiv	NW, S	• Upgrade existing power infrastructure. • Locally produced power through renewables and clean generation. • Utilize existing pathways, such as Green Path 500 kV lines east of the Salton Sea or the corridor along I-80, then into San Diego via the existing grid.
Sandra Burnaman	Indiv	NW	• Energy conservation. • New homes should use solar panels.
Andrew Sefkow	Indiv	NW, G, R	• Renewable, locally-generated power. • Incentives for solar panels within the City of San Diego and on schools and commercial buildings. • If transmission line necessary then new and old lines should be undergrounded through Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve (all of it, not just Rancho Peñasquitos).
Tom and Laura Mauro	Indiv	R	• Since proposing to dismantle existing wooden structures, then put everything underground in Scripps Ranch area.
Edward Huffman	Indiv	R	• Use SWPL route.
Dwight and Cara Baker	Indiv	R	• Underground new and existing lines between Sycamore Canyon and Peñasquitos Substations.
Rebecca Falk	Indiv	NW, G	• Use Canada's policy of reimbursing homeowners for surplus energy generated by home solar panels (includes article from Washington Post). • Local generation.
Anonymous	Indiv	R	• Underground the entire length (esp. near San Diego City).
Sherry Kempin	Indiv	G	• Local power plants.

[10] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Geoff Mack	Indiv	NW, G	• Larger number of smaller, closer energy sources. • Locally generated solar power (e.g., on new homes. • Could use local funding, partnership with State.
Celia Lawley	Indiv	NW	• Local, clean renewable power (e.g., solar). • Change laws for cash back metering on rooftop solar.
Myrna Wosk	Indiv	NW, G	• In-basin generation with new power plant in San Diego along with solar power (includes figure of regional transmission line system).
Todd Saier	Indiv	R[11]	• Put all lines underground through Torrey Hills.
Jeff Martin	Indiv	R, S	• Work with federal/state agencies for desert route along land boundaries with modifications to accommodate requirements for military, wildlife, and transmission line functions (the Western Alternative cuts through the middle of federal land with no regard for military flying restrictions or any adjustments/modifications, that is why it was eliminated) • Reconfigure transmission line with smaller/reduced capacity kV lines that could be underground in Imperial County – existing military height/DoD land use conflicts would be eliminated • Underground 500 kV lines (or multiple smaller lines) along western edge of Imperial County's agricultural lands and adjacent to federal/state land boundaries rather than through private parcels.
Joseph Henseler	Indiv	NW	• Solar power and intelligent use of resources.
Kurt Rasmussen	Indiv	R	• Avoid Julian Hwy and Banner Grade area (around SR-78 and S2 intersection, Scissors Crossing)
Dennis and Adele Delgado, Santa Ysabel	Indiv	R, S, G	• Redundant to LADWP Green Path. • Underground in/around Julian. • Local generation and full use of existing power plants by approving permits for Encina to relocate and improve.
Elaine Tulving, Borrego Springs	Indiv	R	• Start at Salton Sea thermal area and go south. • Use SWPL corridor. • True, dependable solar alternatives.
Jeff Gross	Indiv	R	• Take advantage of existing routes (e.g., co-locate with 56). • Underground the lines.
Judith Withers, San Felipe	Indiv	NW, R, G	• Use I-8 corridor. • Local generation. • Rooftop Solar Initiative.
Rajesh and Joyce Dias, Peñasquitos	Indiv	R	• Underground in Hwy 56.
Joyce Peterson, Descanso	Indiv	R	• Put in rugged, unpopulated terrain in East County where no homes can be built.
Ray Mitchell, Santa Ysabel	Indiv	R	• Go underground or go away.
Renata Di Battista	Indiv	NW	• Renewable and alternative ways of generating power.

[11] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
Robert Staehle	Indiv	NW	• Time-of-Use (TOU) metering, which would give financial incentives to reduce power use during peak demand periods. • SDG&E employ capability for remote shut down of air conditioning and other high power equipment at selected locations (used by some in SCE territory such as NASA Jet Propulsion Lab). • Combination of TOU metering and Remote Shut Down (above). • Rooftop, ground-mount, and carport solar electric energy production required on 50-90% of all new construction and with various incentives schemes for retrofit installation at existing homes/business/government buildings/schools. • Require major power providers to buy excess power, perhaps at reduced wholesale prices, from small generators.
Audrie and Steven Clark	Indiv	NW, G[12]	• Requests programs for conservation, energy efficiency, local renewable energy, more local power generation, and less destructive transmission upgrades. • Replace existing transmission lines with new wires that can conduct more electricity.
Charlie Kurth	Indiv	NW	• Conservation, efficiency, and renewable energy
Constance Hughes	Indiv	NW, S, G	• Replace steel cables with aluminum composite cables with ceramic cores; reconductor. • Evaluate underground alternatives. • Evaluate peaker plants (build 3-5 new ones).
Dayton Higgins	Indiv	NW	• Supports report from UCAN to completely re-wire San Diego and think about way San Diego uses/distributes utility services ("Smart Grid"). • Supports affordable rooftop solar.
Glenda Kimmerly	Indiv	NW	• Energy efficiency and conservation along with rooftop solar and efficient generation within San Diego would eliminate need for Sunrise.
Gloria Silva	Indiv	NW, S	• Imperial Valley Substation to the border, then parallel the forthcoming international border fence, and then traverse north along 805 (planned designated corridor in West Wide Energy EIS). • Assess reliability of geothermal and solar plant capacity in Imperial Valley. • Quantify the amount of renewable energy that SDG&E is legally entitled to distribute (total potential of renewable energy projects). • Identify LADWP's Green Path proposal and other alternatives. • Quantify and include aggressive energy efficiency as part of SRPL. • Quantify for each alternative the percentage of renewable energy provided for San Diego to see how well it addresses the mandate and Governor's goal.

[12] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

Table 4. Alternatives Suggested During Scoping

Commenter	Category	Type[1]	Alternative Description
John Oldson	Indiv	NW, S, G	• New and upgraded existing local power generators • Upgraded power lines in Mexico • Total potential load reduction from energy conservation and distributed generation • Load shifting, such as thermal energy storage for air conditioning • Assess the impact of LEAPS on project objectives
Martin Wang	Indiv	R[13]	• Find route around Park Village Road in Rancho Peñasquitos (especially Park Village Elementary School and residences).
Michael J. Voss	Indiv	NW, G	• If Encina and South Bay power plants are renovated and Otay Mesa power plant is completed then there should be enough power.
Peggy Hurley	Indiv	NW	• Rooftop solar: — SDG&E can lease the rooftop space — Mandate government-owned buildings to have solar panels — Private owners could be compensated.
Pippin Schupbach	Indiv	NW	• Conservation, efficiency, and renewable energy
John Raifsnider	Indiv	NW	• Supports solar, geothermal, wind and ocean wave technology (i.e., wireless).

3.1.4 Environmental Review and Decision-Making Process

Some commenters expressed a concern with the number or timing of scoping meetings held and wanted to have meetings held in other locations in San Diego (East County) and Imperial Counties in order to provide an opportunity for more involvement in the project. Because of the linear distance of the project, some commenters stated that the meetings were too far apart and not convenient. A commenter suggested that meetings in the Borrego Springs area should be held between November and April to maximize participation of winter residents. A few comments were received regarding the length of the comment period and three homeowner groups and the Cleveland National Forest submitted requests for additional time to respond to the NOP.

3.1.5 Project Need

Commenters questioned the Project's objective to provide transmission capability for Imperial Valley renewable resources because this renewable energy is not yet available. There was skepticism that the renewable sources would be permitted or built in time. The delay in obtaining renewable energy would cause SDG&E to seek other sources of energy including those potential sources in the Mexicali Valley. In addition, there was a number of commenters that requested that the Project address Regional Energy Goals that emphasize energy efficiency, demand reduction, distributed generation, other in-county generation and renewable energy before transmission.

Agencies, organizations, and private citizens expressed concern with the Project's potential to import energy from Mexico. The key concern was that upgrades to the Imperial Valley Substation would open up the possibility for SDG&E to import energy from the Mexicali Valley to markets north of San Diego. It also opened up the possibility for additional fossil-fuel facilities to be built in the Mexicali Valley once there

[13] The types of alternatives have been categorized as follows: R (Routing Alternative); S (System Alternative); NW (Non-Wire Alternative); G (Generation Alternative).

was an established transmission line. Imperial County Air Pollution Control Board expressed concern with the Project's potential markets in Mexicali Valley and the potential for further degradation of air quality in Imperial Valley if additional energy facilities are constructed without having to comply with California's stringent air quality standards.

3.2 Summary of All Public and Agency Comments

Appendix C presents a comprehensive summary of all oral and written comments received from the general public, government agencies, and private companies. Appendices C-1 to C-3 provide a summary of all written comments received. Appendix C-4 presents a summary of all comments received at the scoping meetings. Appendix C-5 presents a summary of the agency consultations conducted as part of the scoping process. Appendix D includes copies of written comments received on the SRPL Project and the transcripts of the scoping meetings.

4. Next Steps in EIR/EIS Process

4.1 EIR/EIS Events and Documents

While scoping is the initial step in the environmental review process, additional opportunities to comment on the project EIR/EIS will be provided. Both the CPUC and the BLM will hold additional meetings in early February regarding the alternatives to the project that are proposed to be fully analyzed in the EIR/EIS and those determined to be eliminated from detailed analysis. These meetings will be noticed separately and a second scoping report (Part 2) will be prepared and made available for review. The purpose of these additional meetings is to provide the public and government agencies an opportunity to comment on the alternatives identified for the project. Table 5 presents the proposed schedule for the EIR/EIS and identifies where in the process the public and agencies can provide additional input in the environmental review process.

Table 5. EIR/EIS Events and Documents

Event/Document		Purpose	Approximate Date
		Completed Events/Documents	
Notice of Intent (NOI)	NOI published in the Federal Register	Initiated the public scoping process and served to inform other cooperating agencies of the BLM's and CPUC's intent to prepare an EIR/EIS.	August 31, 2006
Notice of Preparation (NOP)	Release of NOP[14]	Notified interested parties and agencies of the CPUC's and BLM's intent to prepare an EIR/EIS.	September 15, 2006
	Public Review Period	Held public scoping period on the project to provide for public comments on the scope of EIR/EIS.	September 15 to October 20, 2006
Scoping Meetings – NOP	Seven scoping meetings were held	Presented information on the project and provided opportunity for public and agency comments in a public forum.	October 2, 3, 4, and 5, 2006

[14] The NOP was mailed to interested parties, property owners within 300 feet of the project route, federal, State, and local regulatory agencies, and elected officials. Refer to the website for specific EIR/EIS document dates: http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/environment/info/aspen/sunrise/sunrise.htm

Table 5. EIR/EIS Events and Documents

Event/Document		Purpose	Approximate Date
Scoping Report (Part 1)		Reported public and agency comments on the proposed project and environmental issues of concern to the public and agencies.	December 2006
		Upcoming Events/Documents	
Project Alternatives Scoping Meetings	Additional scoping meetings will be held	Presents information on the project and provides opportunity for public and agency comments in a public forum regarding the proposed project alternatives to be fully analyzed in the EIR/EIS and those proposed to be eliminated from detailed analysis.	February 2007
Scoping Report (Part 2)		Updates Scoping Report to include public and agency comments on the proposed project alternatives and environmental issues of concern to the public and agencies from second round of scoping meetings.	March 2007
Draft EIR/EIS	Release of Draft EIR/EIS	Presents impacts and mitigation for the Proposed Project and its alternatives	Summer 2007
	Public Review Period	CEQA: 45-day minimum review period for State agencies. NEPA: BLM requires a 90-day when Plan Amendment is required.	90 days
	Draft EIR/EIS Public Meetings	Allows for public comment on the draft document	Summer 2007
Final EIR/EIS	Release of Final EIR/EIS	Final EIR/EIS, with response to comments, issued by CPUC and BLM Final EIR/EIS is filed with U.S. EPA	November 2007
	Public Review Period	BLM requirements require 30-day period of public review before ROD (BLM Handbook, Chapter VIII)	November to December 2007 (30 days)
Certification of Final EIR/EIS and Project Decision		Commission certifies EIR/EIS and issues a Proposed Decision BLM issues the Record of Decision; 45-day appeal period	Early 2008